

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 219 to 223, 228, 232, 236, 238 to 242, 250 to 257, 259, 260 and 262 to 267 are in the application, of which claim 219 is the independent claim. Claims 219, 241 and 242 are amended herein. No claims are canceled. No new claims are added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

#### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 219-223, 228, 232, 236, 238-242, 250-257, 259, 260 and 262-267 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai (U.S. Patent No. 6,180,445) in view of Korman (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,357). In the footnote on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner also cites Sugaya (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,210). In light of the arguments presented below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 219 is directed to a chip package. The chip package includes a substrate and only one die having a first top surface at a horizontal level. The chip package further includes an adhesive material joining said substrate and said only one die. The chip package further includes a first insulating layer over said horizontal level, over said only one die, over said substrate and across an edge of said only one die, wherein said first insulating layer comprises a first portion over said only one die and a second portion over said substrate but not over said only one die. The chip package further includes a patterned circuit layer over said first insulating layer, over said horizontal level, over said only one die, over said substrate and across the edge, wherein said patterned circuit layer is connected to said only one die through a first opening in said first insulating layer. The chip package further includes an inductor over said horizontal level and over said first insulating layer, and a second insulating layer on said inductor.

In the Office Action, at page 3, lines 5-7, the Examiner considers the first insulating layer 15 of Tsai as being across an edge of said only one die (element 10). Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere in the written description or the figures is Tsai seen to show the insulating layer 15 extending across an edge of substrate 10. (See Fig. 3 of Tsai).

Also in the Office Action, at page 3, lines 5-7, the Examiner considers that Tsai's insulating layer 15 has a second portion over a substrate but not over the only one die 10. Applicants respectfully disagree. Tsai shows that all of insulating layer 15 is over the substrate 10, but fails to teach or suggest that insulating layer 15 has a second portion not over substrate

10. In this regard, the Examiner has not shown which element in Tsai is allegedly the claimed substrate, if the Examiner is unilaterally willing to consider that Tsai's element 10 is allegedly the claimed "only one die." Accordingly, Tsai is not seen to show "a patterned circuit layer over said first insulating layer, over said horizontal level, over said only one die, over said substrate and across said edge, wherein said patterned circuit layer is connected to said only one die through a first opening in said first insulating layer," as provided in Claim 219.

In light of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that Tsai, Korman and Sugaya, either alone or in combination, do not teach or show the above-mentioned features of Claim 219. Amended claim 219 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 claim rejections are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from their respective independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the Amendments and Remarks herein, Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request a notice to this effect. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Dennis A. Duchene/  
Dennis A. Duchene  
Registration No. 40,595

11682 El Camino Real, Suite 400  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Phone: 858.720.3300 DAD:msm  
Facsimile: 858.720.7800  
**Date: November 24, 2009**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 89518  
as our correspondence address.**

**Appendix Related Cases Status**

<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Serial Number</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Examiner Name</u>	<u>Status</u>
085027-0059	10/055,568	1/22/2002	MITCHELL, JAMES M	Non-Final OA mailed 6/24/09
085027-0070	10/174,462	6/17/2002	CHAMBLISS, ALONZO	Issued as Patent No. 6746898
085027-0104	10/755,042	1/9/2004	JACKSON JR, JEROME	Non-Final OA mailed 6/24/09

085027-0059

SDO 177815-1 085027.0059